

Message Text

SECRET

PAGE 01 SALT T 00164 161544 Z

44

ACTION SS-25

INFO OCT-01 ADP-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 CIAE-00 DODE-00 INRE-00

/026 W

----- 081165

O 161515 Z APR 73

FM USDEL SALT TWO II

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 1952

S E C R E T USDEL SALT TWO II 0164

EXDIS SALT

DOD HANDLE AS SPECAT FOR SECDEF

E. O. 11652 XGDSI

TAGS: PARM

SUBJECT: HEADS OF DELEGATION MEETING APRIL 16

1. IN TWO HOUR AND TWENTY MINUTE " HEADS OF DELEGATION" MEETING WITH SEMENOV THIS MORNING NOTHING REALLY NEW EMERGED. MY IMPRESSION WAS THAT PRINCIPAL MESSAGE HE WANTED TO GET ACROSS WAS HIS STRONG DESIRE AT LEAST TO ENTER INTO NEGOTIATIONS ON AND PREFERABLY TO CONCLUDE SOME UNDERSTANDINGS OR AGREEMENTS ON " PARTIAL MEASURES" DRAWN FROM THEIR APRIL 6 DRAFT UNDERSTANDING. HE SPECIFICALLY CITED MEASURES ON NEW KINDS OF STRATEGIC OFFENSIVE WEAPONS WHICH COULD INCREASE THE DANGERS OF WAR, RESTRAINT ON SYSTEMS NOT LIMITED BY AGREEMENT, AND NEW LARGE PROGRAMS (PARA 5 OF THEIR DRAFT), AND NON- TRANSFER. IN DOING SO HE DREW PARALLEL WITH BENEFICIAL EFFECTS OF HAVING NEGOTIATED AND WORKED OUT HOT LINE AND ACCIDENT MEASURES IN SALT ONE- I PRIOR TO MOSCOW AGREEMENTS.

2. IN RESPONSE I POINTED UP THAT IN CONTRAST TO HOT LINE AND ACCIDENT AGREEMENTS, WHICH COULD STAND BY THEMSELVES, HIS PROPOSALS ON PARTIAL MEASURES COULD OBVIOUSLY NOT BE NEGOTIATED UNLESS AND UNTIL THERE WAS AGREEMENT ON WHAT WOULD BE INCLUDED IN BASIC AGREEMENT ON CENTRAL SYSTEMS AND HOW THEY WOULD BE LIMITED. I SAID THAT I THOUGHT THAT PROBABLY SOME OF THE THOUGHTS THEY HAD WITH REGARD TO PARTIAL MEASURES COULD BE INCLUDED IN A PERMANENT AGREEMENT, BUT THE UNDERSTANDING ON CENTRAL SYSTEMS MUST FIRST BE ACCOMPLISHED. HE AGAIN

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 SALT T 00164 161544 Z

SPOKE ABOUT TIME URGENCY AND IMPORTANCE OF SHOWING FORWARD
PROGRESS

RATHER THAN " MARKING TIME." HE REPEATEDLY EMPHASIZED IMPORTANCE OF
GETTING AGREEMENTS AT THE " CURRENT SESSION."

3. DURING COURSE OF HIS PRESENTATION, WHICH WAS LARGELY FROM
WRITTEN

NOTES, HE ALSO PROBED FOR SHADES OF MEANING THAT I MIGHT BE IMPLYING
BY USING THE TERM " LONG- TERM AGREEMENT" ON SOME OCCASIONS AND
" PERMANENT AGREEMENT" ON OTHER OCCASIONS. HE ALSO ASKED WHEN HE
COULD EXPECT A REPLY WITH RESPECT TO THEIR INQUIRIES OF US ON
QUALITATIVE LIMITATIONS, IN PARTICULAR MRVS/ MIRVS.

4. HE ALSO STRESSED IMPORTANCE THEY ATTACHED TO FBS, REAFFIRMING
UNACCEPTABILITY OF OUR PROPOSAL OF EQUAL NUMBERS ON CENTRAL
SYSTEMS.

HOWEVER HE ASKED WHAT KIND OF " PHASING" I HAD IN MIND WITH REGARD TO
CENTRAL SYSTEMS AS WELL AS TIMING AND SCOPE OF OUR PROPOSAL.

5. DURING THE COURSE OF REPEATING OUR POSITION AND REPLYING TO
HIS QUESTIONS, I SAID THAT IF A PART OF THEIR PROBLEM WAS CONCERN
THAT WE WERE SEEKING TO REVISE NUMBERS IN INTERIM AGREEMENT BEFORE
EXPIRATION OF ITS FIVE- YEAR TERM, I THOUGHT IT WOULD BE POSSIBLE
TO WRITE A PERMANENT AGREEMENT IN A FORM WHICH WOULD PERMIT THE
CONTINUANCE OF THOSE NUMBERS FOR THE FIVE- YEAR PERIOD, AT THE END
OF

WHICH THE AGREEMENT ON EQUAL CEILINGS WE ARE SEEKING WILL BECOME
EFFECTIVE. I SAID THAT WHETHER EQUAL CEILINGS WERE ACHIEVED EITHER
BY REDUCTIONS OR INCREASES ON ONE SIDE OR THE OTHER, THIS OBVIOUSLY
COULD NOT TAKE PLACE " OVER NIGHT" BUT WOULD RATHER HAVE TO BE A
PHASE PROCESS. THE ESSENTIAL QUESTION STILL WAS WHETHER THEY
ACCEPTED

THE PRINCIPLE OF EQUAL NUMBERS IN THE CENTRAL SYSTEMS AS WE HAD PRO-
POSED -- IF THEY WOULD DO SO WE COULD THEN MOVE AHEAD TO WHAT WOULD
UNDOUBTEDLY BE TOUGH NEGOTIATIONS ON THESE QUESTIONS OF LEVELS,
PHASING, ETC.

6. IN MAKING FOREGOING PRESENTATION I REPEATED OUR POSITION ON TIMING

OF NEGOTIATION OF NON- CENTRAL SYSTEM AGREEMENT. I SAID ONCE
SUBSTANTIAL

AGREEMENT HAD BEEN REACHED ON CENTRAL SYSTEMS WE COULD THEN BEGIN
NEGOTIATION ON NON- CENTRAL SYSTEMS AND WHEN AGREEMENT WAS
REACHED

ON THOSE SYSTEMS, THE CENTRAL AND NON- CENTRAL UNDERSTANDINGS

WOULD
BE BROUGHT TOGETHER IN A PERMANENT AGREEMENT. I POINTED OUT THAT
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 SALT T 00164 161544 Z

UNDER THIS FORMULA THEIR POSITIONS (AS WELL AS OURS) WOULD BE
FULLY PROTECTED AND THAT THEY WOULD NOT BE FORCED INTO SIGNING
SOME-
THING ON CENTRAL SYSTEMS WITHOUT KNOWING WHAT THE AGREEMENT
WOULD BE
ON NON- CENTRAL SYSTEMS. I OF COURSE DID NOT GIVE ANY REPLY TO HIS
INQUIRY ON MRVS/ MIRVS.

7. ALTHOUGH IT IS HARD TO TELL AND IT MAY SEEM STRANGE IN THE LIGHT
OF EVERYTHING THAT HAS PASSED BETWEEN US, I HAD THE FEELING THIS
MORNING THAT PERHAPS FOR THE FIRST TIME HE REALLY GRASPED THE KIND
OF A SCENARIO WE HAD IN MIND.

8. AS A FOOTNOTE IN REFERRING TO A QUESTION THAT I HAD PUT TO
HIM AT A PREVIOUS MEETING WITH REGARD TO " RESTRAINT" HE SAID
THAT AN AGREEMENT ON THIS WOULD OF COURSE BE APPLICABLE TO BOTH
SIDES AND COULD COME INTO EFFECT " AT A SPECIFICALLY AGREED DATE."
INCIDENTALLY IN REPLY TO MY QUESTION, HE SAID THAT HE HAD " NOT YET"
RECEIVED INSTRUCTIONS TO RETURN TO MOSCOW DURING OUR RECESS.
JOHNSON

SECRET

*** Current Handling Restrictions *** EXDIS
*** Current Classification *** SECRET

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: Z
Capture Date: 01 JAN 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 16 APR 1973
Decaption Date: 28 MAY 2004
Decaption Note: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: garlanwa
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1973SALTT00164
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: XGDS-1
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: SALT TALKS
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1973/newtext/t19730443/aaaaiors.tel
Line Count: 149
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: ACTION SS
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: EXDIS
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 3
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: EXDIS
Reference: n/a
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: garlanwa
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 30 JAN 2002
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <30-Jan-2002 by collinp0>; APPROVED <14 FEB 2002 by garlanwa>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: <DBA CORRECTED> jms 980120
Subject: HEADS OF DELEGATION MEETING APRIL 16
TAGS: PARM
To: SECSTATE WASHDC
SS
Type: TE
Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005